Polish-Language Clandestine Press Published under the Patronage of Kanstancin Kalinoŭski

BY
DOROTA MICHALUK*

The Uprising of 1863 celebrated its 150th anniversary in 2013. In Polish historiography it is known as the January Uprising, and in Belarusian it is named after Kanstancin Kalinoŭski (Polish: Konstanty Kalinowski), one of the leaders of the Red camp. Both names actually downgrade the importance of this event. The first one because of the timing of the Uprising – although [the Tsarist authorities] cracked down on the majority of the rebelling troops already by the end of the spring in 1863, the Uprising ran over into the following year. The name of the Uprising in Belarusian historiography downplays its significance by narrowing it down only to one leader of the Red camp. As a result, the White camp, which was active in Lithuania and Belarus, but also the involvement of these regions in the insurgent activity in the Kingdom of Poland, still remain outside of the domain of their discussion about the Uprising. Regardless of the vested political interests of either camp, yet not discluding those contradictions and conversation about the programme among them, the 1863–1864 Uprising was a joint effort by individuals from all of the various provinces of the former Rzeczpospolita, and unfolded under the slogan of 'Pahonia beside to the sign of the Earl' ('Obok Orła Znak Pogonii').

A mythology arose around Kanstancin Kalinoŭski, which achieved a particular significance once he passed away and created a new national awareness among future generations of Belarusians. A very limited number of resources are responsible for fostering the foundational myths with regards to Kalinoŭski. Despite significant interest in Kalinoŭski, there is actually no solid, multi-layered scholarly monograph that demonstrates how his biography unfolded in terms of its specific historical context, as well as his familial, conspirational and political connections. Publication of a book of this kind would doubtlessly have to

* Dr hab. Dorota Michaluk is an Associate Professor in the Department of Eastern Europe at Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń (Poland). She is the author of the book 'Białoruska Republika Ludowa 1918–1920. U podstaw białoruskiej tożsamości' (Toruń 2010, Smoleńsk 2015). This research was funded under the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of Poland project 'National Programme for the Development of Humanities in 2012–2015'.

be based on thorough analysis, but should also take into for Kalinoŭski's closest entourage.

This article focuses on illegal Polish-language newspapers that were published (at least a portion of them) with the approval and, it would appear, under the patronage of Kanstancin Kalinoŭski. These publications were put out by the Red camp: *The Flag of Freedom* (Chorągiew Swobody) and *The Voice of Litva* (Głos z Litwy). Unlike *Mužyckaja Praŭda*, both of which sought the nobility as their primary audience. This article aims to analyse the content of these newspapers, which are less controversial than Kalinoŭski's own newspapers that were guided towards the peasantry. They do not raise the issue of a division between Lithuania, Belarus and Kingdom of Poland, but instead make use of language and ideas that characterise the provinces as part of a great whole. They also do not contain any contentious social slogans that emanated out of the periodical *Mužyckaja Praŭda*. This all demonstrates that Kalinoŭski was not only a Romantic hero, but also a pragmatic politician. The slogan 'Everyone is Equal' from the democratic Reds was common for all three newspapers.

This article discusses the programme of the Reds, drawn from the official periodical of the Central National Committee, *Ruch*, but also compares the programme of the Reds in Lithuania and Belarus as it was presented in Polish-language newspapers like *Chorągiew Swobody* and *Głos z Litwy*. It should be noted that first newspaper was published as an official instrument of the Lithuanian Provincial Committee, and the second was its unofficial instrument. To conclude, a brief summary is provided at the end of the article.

Political Goals of the Whites and Reds

Upon Tsar Nicholas I's death and Russia's defeat in the Crimean War, a loss that exposed the empire's weaknesses, society started to nourish hope for a thorough systematic and social transformation. The new tsar, Alexander II, pushed forth with a new liberalisation policy, particularly with local politics. The actual loosening up of control by the regime in the first months of his rule and the expectations of change brought about a revival of activity in conspiratorial circles which had been established in various social and professional circles. There was a similar situation in the western part of the Russian Empire, specifically in the Kingdom of Poland and in the former territories of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, where clandestine organisations were becoming more active and patriotic sentiments began to rise once more. This seen in various manifestations of their views, be it through gatherings, the distribution of illegal publications or developing their respective political programmes.

In April 1861 the Warsaw Red circles, initially somewhat disjointed, elected a committee, and at the time was most likely already called the *Ruch* (Movement) Committee by then. It was the foundations of the Central National Committee which was established to represent the Red faction that aimed at achieving independence via armed insurrection. The Reds, also called the Red National Organisation, represented the young student nobility, intelligentsia, craftsmen, soldiers and low-ranking officials. A large number of the movement's leaders (including Kanstancin Kalinoŭski, Zygmunt Sierakowski and Zygmunt Padlewski) advocated for mutual resistance with the Russian and military activists. Their political views were shaped by the ideas of Alexander Herzen and Nikolay Chernyshevsky, but western European democratic thought, as exhibited by the Spring of Nations experience, the Italian struggle for the unification of Italy and the role of lower classes and people's leader Giuseppe Garibaldi in the process were even more influential.

The restoration of an independent Polish state was also the goal of the so-called White faction, which represented landowners, industrialists and bourgeoisie circles. The Whites were more cautious in their activities than the Reds. They did not see any chance in a battle breaking out between civilians and the army without international support and, consequently, they promoted more organic work as well as obtaining cultural, educational and political licenses by way of cooperation with the government. They postponed thoughts of any armed insurrection until a time that they felt would be more suitable. In their opinion, without the help of the western powers, an uprising had no chance of succeeding. Lithuania and Belarus were not prepared for this kind of resistance and, therefore, a lot of people shared Franciszek Dalewski's view that, 'the participation of the nobility in an early uprising would kill the dreams of the future' (Sikorska-Kulesza, Bairauskaitė 2010, 175).

The same opinion was held by his brother-in-law Zygmunt Sierakowski from the Red faction in Lithuania, and Jakób Gieysztor, the leader of the local White' party, viewed this in much the same way (Gieysztor 1921, 104). Sierakowski was in favour of cooperation with the Russian democrats and the participation of the army and peasants in the uprising; in Lithuania he was slowly building a network that could ensure a force to engage in military action. The White' leaders tried to mitigate the radicalism of the Reds. The Reds in the Kingdom of Poland pushed particularly hard for an uprising. After creating the Central National Committee in the middle of 1862, they began to become active with the purpose of 'preparing the country for a general, successful uprising which was to return Poland's independence with its 1771 borders, and the complete freedom and equality before the law for all its inhabitants regardless of faith, and with respect to the rights of nations united with it' (Prasa tajna 1966, 335). It was at this same time that the first principle of 'political faith' confession was represented by the Reds[1].

[1] The term 'principles of political faith' was taken from the original texts of Ruch.

Political beliefs of the Reds from the Kingdom of Poland

The Reds published its political programme in the *Ruch* (Movement) newspaper, the official Central National Committee organ in the Kingdom of Poland. It began coming out in Warsaw on 5 July 1862 and was distributed to other provinces. The title is derived from the chief slogan of the Reds, which called for 'constant progress and movement that would lead to an independent Poland'.

The term 'movement' was used with regards to the whole faction. The Reds wanted to achieve their goals by restoring independent Poland, using an uprising as a way to fight for it, all while making no deals with the Russian government and undermining the trust in the government and ignoring its decrees. All of this was guided at destabilising the situation and making the country ungovernable (Prasa tajna 1966, 333).

It was believed that an uprising that was done strictly in the name of 'social issues' and 'abstract freedom' would have no chances of succeeding. It could have been successful provided that the nation would take part in it. The nation should also be liberated within 'the pre-partition borders, particularly within the borders of Poland which is spiritually composed of three nations: Poland, Lithuania and Rus'' (Prasa tajna 1966, 334). Limiting it only to the Kingdom of Poland would essentially be giving consent to the partition and would not guarantee a chance to maintain the independence it would ostensibly regain. It was therefore emphasized that 'the nation may only rise for the purpose of national liberation, and only in the name of freedom and independence of the whole of Poland (understood here as the pre-partition lands belonging to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth)' (Prasa tajna 1966, 334).

The concept of 'nation' had several meanings. It was understood to include the inhabitants of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, but also the inhabitants of Poland, Lithuania and Rus', as well as an ethnic group. It was thought that, 'Poland was made up of three ethnic groups, all equal to one another, united by an institution and an idea of freedom. Therefore, Poland rising up in the name of these principles would not pose a threat to any of these ethnic groups as it holds each of them in esteem and grants rights to each of them that are derived from their own separate and individual characteristics' (Prasa tajna 1966, 334).

However, it appears that the views held by the representatives of the Kingdom of Poland regarding the issue of ethnicity in the eastern territories were somewhat superficial. New national tendencies appeared to be rather strong, particularly in Ukraine where Ukrainian nationalism had been gradually developing. The separatist tendencies present in Ukraine were known in the Kingdom of Poland, but these lands were still seen as being traditionally united with the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Thus, attempts to restore the borders from 1772 (even as federation of Ukraine and Poland) meant that Ukrainians set aside any thoughts

of Ukrainian lands being unified, particularly since a majority of lands were in the seventeenth century were controlled by Imperial Russia[2].

The authors of the first issue of *Ruch* presented their views from the perspective of a potential separatist threat in Ukraine-Rus'. While the possibility of divergent uprisings were taken into consideration, they were only accounted for in terms of a reality where Poland had gained independence. Separatism was seen as betrayal at the time. It was thought that acting according to the principle of 'respect for the will of people that constitutes a whole with Poland' would guarantee the unity of the rising nations and these relationships with an independent Poland (and in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth) would remain (Prasa tajna 1966, 361). No other alternative to a centralised Polish state within the old pre-partition borders was taken into consideration. Importantly, the Reds, while considering the borders of the future state, referred to the tradition of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth only in terms of its physical territory. However, it completely broke with the nobility system of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The Reds thought the future independent Polish state should be based upon the principles of social, legal and religious equality[3].

The second principle of 'political faith' formulated by the journalists of *Ruch* was the formation of a national government, recognised in society that renounced loyalty to the partitioning government and rejected the partition agreements and the 1815 Congress of Vienna treaty (Prasa tajna 1966, 335–336). The third principle referred to the involvement of the rural and urban population in the struggle for independence and supporting it with the 'mighty, but not radical, people's foundations' (Prasa tajna 1966, 339). For that purpose the lower classes of society would receive a proper education and, thus, life as it was experienced in the countryside would be changed.

However, the Reds understood that implementation of these two goals was not enough to turn these lower classes into 'citizens' loyal to the national cause and to be entrusted with equal rights. This could only happen through the broader participation of the peasantry in the national struggle as only they could make them a noticeable political and social partner. The Reds viewed the lower classes as the main driving force in the struggle for independence.

---

2 Kieniewicz points to this (1863, 177).

3 'In addition to the ground of national restoration of Poland in pre-partition borders, the Polish uprising will rise the banner of human freedom and equal rights for all. Poland is one mother for all her children despite any differences and occupation. A peasant, a burgher and a nobleman are free and completely equal before the law. Estates will be abolished, and the emergence of Poland will bring only one equal and free estate. Poland will not have privileges and classes, only the natural divisions arising from employment or education will remain, but they will not have any legal distinction. The freedom and equality which Poland provides to the associated nations and all residents regardless of their estate, will also concern faith. A Catholic, Uniate, Protestant, Orthodox, Armenian, Jew or Muslim – all are sons of one homeland, everyone is equal and free!' (Prasa tajna 1966, 334–335).

At the same time they seemed to realise that notions like 'homeland' and 'political independence' were too abstract for peasants. The peasantry was more interested in individual matters such as land ownership, cottages, relations with landowners and the abolition of serfdom. Therefore, it was proposed that: 'an effective force in the struggle for independence could only be guaranteed with the widespread participation of the peasantry, for whom the issues of social well-being remained among the most important'. The *Ruch* emphasized that the Polish government must put serfdom to an end (with compensation) and reform the countryside so that 'a peasant would yearn for political freedom and feel the need to take up arms and fight the enemies of Poland' (Prasa tajna 1966, 343). Therefore, it called for handing over fertile lands and spreading the ideas of brotherhood among the classes, which formulated the fourth article of 'political faith' (Prasa tajna 1966, 343).

The whole programme was stipulated again in the tenth issue of *Ruch* on 18 December 1862:

> Having based our cause on the grounds of genuine Polish principle, we remain faithful to our spirit and national needs, and we also call for introducing many classes to a political life and freedom, including the rural and urban populations. We want the peasantry and bourgeoisie to have the same rights as the nobility has, in other words we want a nation based on brotherhood, not divided up into classes, but equally free. We also want freedom to be granted the peasantry through paying off their rent to the landowners from state funds; we want complete tolerance and we will have it for Poland, Lithuania and Rus' united as one, because the demands and objectives of our programme satisfy the needs of everyone, regardless of their class, language or faith. Our demands are really nation-oriented and just (Prasa tajna 1966, 362).

Belarus and Lithuania in the Plans of the Uprising

The activities in Lithuania and Belarus played a special role in the insurgent plans of the Central National Committee. Zygmunt Padlewski, a graduate of the Artillery Military Academy (the military commander for Warsaw during the uprising), worked out the details of a military action plan for the future uprising. During his time studying in Saint Petersburg, from 1857–1859, he belonged to a military conspiracy group that had been established by Zygmunt Sierakowski, who was studying at the General Staff Academy.

Kanstancin Kalinoŭski, a student at Saint Petersburg University's law faculty, also belonged to the group. In the summer of 1862 Kalinoŭski was a guest at

the wedding of Zygmunt and Apolonia née Dalewska, a sister of a well-known conspirator, Franciszek Dalewski (Kieniewicz 1983, 293). The wedding was an opportunity for meeting other leaders of the Red faction in Lithuania such as Captain Jan Staniewicz and Reverend Mackiewicz. The wedding was on the day of the Union of Lublin anniversary which was celebrated boisterously.

Padlewski's strategic plan was based on the military history stemming from the November Uprising and even the Kościuszko Uprising as well debates held in exile and within the country by military men and theoreticians such as Dezydery Chłapowski, Ludwik Bystrzonowski, Reverend Adam Czartoryski or Karol Bogumił Stolzman (Fajnhauz 1999, 113–115). They thought that the success of the uprising in the Kingdom of Poland would depend on the course of events in Lithuania, Belarus and Ukraine. They also considered geographic conditions of the marshy Polesia and Minsk region, the Kaunas and Hrodna forests and primeval forests to be conducive to guerrilla warfare. An important role was also attributed to the Baltic Sea coast, which they set their hopes on being a conduit for obtaining arms and ammunition by sea. (After the uprising broke out, the Lithuanian military commander Zygmunt Sierakowski concentrated all of his efforts on it). The chief purpose of the military action in Lithuania and Belarus was to tie up the Russian forces and not allow them to enter the territory of the Kingdom of Poland. A few guerilla groups were supposed to hold control over the main passageways leading from the Kingdom of Poland to Moscow and Saint Petersburg. Special attention was given to the Saint Petersburg – Warsaw railway line which ran through Grodno, Kowno and Dyneburg, and the Warsaw – Moscow line via Brest and Bobrujsk (Kieniewicz 1983, 329). The Hrodna region also had its special role as it was adjacent to the Kingdom of Poland and both railway tracks ran through its territory.

Although the Central National Committee could not imagine the uprising taking place without the participation of Lithuania and Belarus, preparation was very poorly executed in these territories. The organisational structure of the Red National Organisation was poorly developed and worse than those of the Whites, whose cautious politics had more proponents among the nobility and landowners. The Whites also represented the intelligentsia of noble origins, as well as officials, the Roman Catholic clergy, the bourgeoisie and a segment of the Jewish industrial and financial elite. In one of its official manifestos, it called for the return of the Statutes of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the revival of the University of Wilno, recruiting officials from the domestic population, the formation of a lending society and a revival of the meetings of the nobility which had been suspended since introduction of the state of emergency. Indeed, these were attempts to gain political and cultural autonomy for Lithuania (Fajnhauz 1999, 94).

In April 1862, Aleksander Domeyko, the elected marshal of the Wilno nobility, sent a project for the school systems' reorganisation that called for the

introduction of the Polish language in Polish gymnasiums. He also proposed that the language of instruction in folk rural schools should be the dominant dialect of a given village (Fajnhauz 1999, 94). Some members of the Whites, including Jakób Gieysztor, thought it was necessary to win the support of the peasantry. Therefore, some of the Whites advocated the immediate abolition of serfdom by the nobility and coming up with a solution to the issue faster than the Russian government had set out to. He realised that from the point of view of relations between the nobility and peasantry, it was important who would be effective in the enfranchisement: the landowners or the government. The Whites in Lithuania postulated the organic work and estimated that the premature outbreak of an uprising in Lithuania would bring about defeat and lead to the destruction of the country. However, they firmly held that should an uprising break out in the Kingdom of Poland, they would support it in the name of national solidarity.

Still, the influence of the Whites in the Lithuanian and Belarusian society was less significant. The dominant groups within the White camp were educated officials from the middle and petty nobility as well as students, military men and low-ranking officials. The group thought that independence could be restored only by military means.

The Red Vilnius Committee, on the other hand, included Captain Ludwik Zwierzdowski, Bolesław Dłuski, Achilles Bonoldi, Edmund Weryho and the most radical figure of them all, Kanstancin Kalinoŭski. The head of the Central National Committee in Vilnius, originally called the 'Ruch Committee', and then the Provincial Lithuanian Committee, was Nestor du Laurans. From the very beginning he held rather centralistic tendencies. For one, he argued with other members of the Central National Committee over the scope of competencies.

Unofficially, they also discussed the nature of the uprising: whether it was supposed to be just a nobility and bourgeoisie revolt, or it would also involve the peasant forces as provided by the program of the Red published in the *Ruch* (Kieniewicz 1983, 293–294). At the same time, they realised how little influence the Reds really had in these environments. Therefore, they started active work towards attracting the peasantry to join in the struggle against the Russian state.

Propaganda of the Reds Targeting Peasants in Lithuania and Belarus

The propaganda, aimed at peasants in the Hrodna region, was put out through *Hutorka dwóch susiedaŭ* and *Mužyckaja Praŭda*, which were published in Białystok in Belarusian which employed a Latin script (Prasa tajna 1966, 156–166, 301–304, 318–329). The first one was published by the group gathered around Bronisław Szwarc, and the next issue by several people, including Kanstancin Ka-

linoŭski and Walery Wróblewski. Journalists from both of these periodicals relied on peasants' dissatisfaction with the unsuccessful implementation of the Emancipation Reform of 19 February 1861 and the objections of the countryside raised to the levy in place, despite prior promises to renounce these practices. They also called for the restoration of the Greek Catholic Church.

In the propaganda, which strayed quite far from historical truth, they presented the old Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth as a mainstay of respecting peasants' rights, and incited to restore 'Polish rule'. They also called for democratic equality, freedom and a brotherhood of all classes. The most radical views in the group with regards to the peasants' cause were represented by Kanstancin Kalinoŭski who, since the middle of 1862, was a fully authorised commissar in the Hrodna Voivodeship. His attitudes towards the nobility, which he urged the peasants to rise up against, lead to a conflict with du Laurans and an attempt to create a separate group of Reds in Lithuania, independent of the National Government.

It should be emphasized that these arguments concerned organisational matters and the means by which the struggle should be carried out. The activities of Kanstancin Kalinoŭski should not be interpreted as a struggle for an independent Lithuania and Belarus, but rather as an attempt to break away from Russia with the Kingdom of Poland that held as one of its central tenets the restoration of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

Propaganda of the Reds Targeting Nobility and Land-Owners in Lithuania and Belarus

Despite attempts to bring the peasants into the fold for the uprising or force them to fight for their own rights, the Reds in Lithuania by no means renounced the idea of winning the support of landowners and nobility, and assured these classes of the need to take military action. These kinds of initiatives were also undertaken by Kanstancin Kalinoŭski who, in his work, relied mostly on the groups. In order to win sympathy from the nobility, he tried to persuade the legendary conspirator, Franciszek Dalewski to support the Reds. These attempts proved to be fruitless as Dalewski turned out to be very circumspect about any military efforts which he considered to be premature and destructive, and ultimately led him to join the Whites (Apolonia z Dalewskich 2010, 176).

The Reds encouraged the nobility not only by personal persuasion, but also through their publications. The press aimed at preparing society for the uprising by inspiring a sense of patriotism and sought to win support for the Reds' programme. While censorship was prevalent, clandestine printing operations were flourishing. The information gathered by Stefan Kieniewicz's team appears to show that the

total number of publications of this type, which appeared between 1861–1864, climbed to a few dozen (Prasa tajna 1966, V). In these publications the different sides presented their respective programmes as well as their political and social goals. The Reds distributed *Chorągiew Swobody* (Banner of Freedom) and *Głos z Litwy* (Voice from Lithuania) from the Kingdom of Poland to Lithuania, targeting the nobility, officials and bourgeoisie. Just like in the case of *Mužyckaja Praŭda* both of these periodicals were published with the consent, and allegedly, also by inspiration of Kanstancin Kalinoŭski.

In these publications, the authors propagated not only the idea of national unity in the former lands of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, but also unity with the Russian revolutionary-democratic movement, emphasizing the differences between the Russian nation and its government actions. *Chorągiew Swobody* did not raise the issue of ethnic identity in Lithuania and Belarus, but emphasized the national commonwealth, tradition and territorial unity which were marked by the 'borders of national mourning' (Prasa tajna 1966, 400).

The first issue came out in Wilno on 1 January 1863, a few weeks before the outbreak of uprising. It was largely devoted to theoretical considerations about the role of nation in the struggle for independence of homeland. According to one author of a text found in it, the time had come to act:

> The moment of action and brotherhood is already upon us and neither the bloody bacchanalia of the invasion on the streets of Warsaw against the helpless, nor the exiles, the gallows, or military pressure have shaken our belief in victory and will not manage to shake it.
>
> The revolutionary state has existed here since 27 February 1861, despite the frenzied level of repression, cannot continue for long. The time for an outbreak, the time for a general uprising in the name of holy rights of nationalities is quickly approaching and nobody seems to doubt our moral powers, therefore material forces now needs to be estimated and prepared. The Lithuanian Provincial Committee as an organisational power in Lithuania and Belarus therefore calls on all citizens that genuinely cherish their homeland, regardless of class or religion, to fight for national independence right now.
>
> In embracing the principle of equality between all classes and religions without prejudice to anybody's property or freedom of conscience, calling everyone, without exception, from all strata of the Polish society to work in unity in the name of freedom and nationality, the Provincial Committee is certain that by doing so it will satisfy the general unanimous demand of the country. The act of contrition by Poland rising after an almost century-long undeserved

> penitence shall be made not by a parliamentary exchange or diplomatic and social speculations, but by action (…) (Prasa tajna 1966, 400).

These were the words used by the Lithuanian Provincial Committee, the organisational authority in Lithuania and Belarus, calling on the people of these lands to take up arms. The text emphasized a strictly defined relationship between Lithuania and Belarus with the Kingdom of Poland and the 'Polish cause' of that time by referring to the events in Warsaw in February 1861. It was this time when the army opened fire at protesters at Royal Castle Square, an event which led not only to the death of five people, but also generated greater patriotic sentiments and led to the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania's national mourning.

In the first issue of *Chorągiew Swobody* the words 'nation', 'homeland' and 'Poland' were used frequently. The context in which they appeared clearly demonstrates how notions like 'homeland' and 'Poland' were used to refer to all of the lands of the old Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Similarly, the concept of 'nation', used with no ethnic tinge, referred to all of the inhabitants of the lands that were a part of the old and future Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, regardless of class or nationality. The Lithuanian Provincial Committee turned to the citizens of Lithuania and Belarus, calling on them to stand beside the people of the Duchy. Importantly, the issue was addressed to the Lithuanian and Belarusian nobility, trying to convince them of the necessity of fighting and making a material sacrifice. In their address, they promised the nobility the right to maintain ownership of their land, which was an important statement in the context of the accusations levelled against Kanstancin Kalinoŭski and his apparent willingness to expropriate land on behalf of the peasants and his alleged anti-nobility attitude.

An important point in the programme of the Reds in Lithuania and Belarus was the involvement of Russian democrats in a combined struggle against the tsarist regime. Plans of a joint rebellion were prepared, although the Great Russia governorates were even less thoroughly prepared for an armed struggle than its Lithuanian counterpart. The first issue of *Chorągiew Swobody* described these plans. The editors made a clear distinction between the Russian official authorities, the tsarist regime and the Russian nation (or representatives of the Russian revolutionary-democratic movement), writing that it 'yearns to be not an invader but our free brother' (Prasa tajna 1966, 400).

The second issue of *Chorągiew Swobody* came out in Wilno on 19 February 1863, a month after the uprising began. The content of this issue was almost entirely devoted to calling on the nobility and landowners (citizens) of Lithuania and Belarus to rise up against the Russian empire and maintain solidarity with the inhabitants of the Kingdom of Poland. The Lithuanian Provincial Committee

called itself the Provisional Provincial Government of Lithuania and Belarus, and presented itself as the only legal government of the territories in question. It demanded that the domestic population denounce their loyalty to the Russian state, but also declared independence from the Central National Committee on military issues.

Nevertheless, this declaration had nothing to do with breaking away from the insurgent authorities in Warsaw. In fact, it even emphasized Wilno' dependence on the Central National Committee as the supreme executive centre (also by the use of the term 'Provincial'): 'Convinced of our own powers, supported by the recognition of the country, *on an order from Nation's central power* [the Central National Committee] we raised our banner over a host of workers in Lithuania and Belarus (…). May the nation of Lithuania and Belarus hasten under this banner! And this is the sole legal Provisional Provincial Government that is calling you under it (…). Blessed with the recent union of martyrs, with your brothers at the Vistula and Dnieper in the face of enemy, the world may be confirmed by our steadfast prowess in battle at the Nioman and Vilija. And the struggle is holy as it is the struggle for all of your quartered lands, for the property of the disinherited sons in their own homeland, the holy blood heroically shed for the freedom and equality of all religions, traditions and languages of your brothers!' (Prasa tajna 1966, 402–403).

The programme of the Reds was formulated in the *Chorągiew Swobody* newspaper as follows: restoration of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth to its state independence within the borders from 1772, enfranchisement, democratisation of societal principles, the abolition of the tsarist regime by military action, solidarity between all social groups and an alliance with the Russian democrats.

The territorial unity of all Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth lands advanced by reports of insurgents fighting in the Podlasie, Hrodna region, in the Czersk and Rawa Land in Mazovia as well as in the Lublin region (Prasa tajna 1966, 403–404).

The military press organ of the Lithuanian Provincial Committee was *Wiadomości o powstaniu na Litwie* ('News about the uprising in Lithuania'). Six issues were published between 25 March and 12 May 1863 (Fajnhauz 1963, 87–88). It provided very concise information that had been collected from commanders of the uprising in the poviats and voivodeships about their military gains, though it did not include any reference to the programme.

The need to inform people about the situation on the front led them to publish *Głos z Litwy* as an unofficial organ of the Executive Department of Lithuania (Fajnhauz 1963, 91–92). The periodical started to come out in the final stages of the uprising, between 1 February and 1 April 1864 five issues were published in

Königsberg, out of the reach of the Russian police. For the sake of putting out disinformation, the title vignette named the city of Vilnius as the printing location. It was intended to have an informational character, with updates on the development of the uprising in Lithuania that encouraged support for it.

The foundation for the programme for *Głos z Litwy* was the *Manifesto* from 22 January 1863 published by the Central National Committee, which at the same time formed the Provisional National Government. At the moment when the January Uprising broke out, the National Central Committee proclaimed that all of the 'sons of Poland', regardless of their faith, origin and class, were free and equal citizens of the country. It has also granted land, so far held in tenure in exchange for rent or physical labour, to peasants unconditionally and also offered them inheritance rights, all while offering compensation to current landowners out of state funds. It also guaranteed that the families of landless and hired labourers who would join in the uprising or die in defence of homeland a right to get their own land. The nations of Poland, Lithuania and Rus' were called to fight under the common banner of an Eagle, Pahonia and Archangel. The newspaper addressed the Russian nation in very strong words and warned of giving support to the tsarist regime against the insurgents.

For the journalists of *Głos z Litwy*, the *Manifesto* of the National Central Committee was fundamental, therefore their goals did not differ from those of the Reds: 'securing the freedom, unity and independence of our homeland, with equality for all regardless of class or religion before the law, with the freedom of conscience and opinion and raising the peasantry to the rank of a citizen' (Prasa tajna 1966, 201). The audience for the periodical is clearly defined and the authors turn to him in a very straightforward way: 'To you, the Polish nation, may this newspaper be comfort, a forerunner of a better future, may it be one of a thousand pieces of proof that despite the army of Wieszatiel (Hangman) and a horde of venal policemen, the fetters of restraint are falling apart day by day' (Prasa tajna 1966, 204).

Although the first issue of *Chorągiew Swobody* made a distinction between the Russian nation and tsarist administration, *Głos z Litwy* seemed to possess clearly anti-Russian overtones and any accusation made against Russia targeted its civilisation or its cultural contradictions.

Two days before the death of Kanstancin Kalinoŭski, hanged on Lukiskes square in Vilnius on 20 March 1864 after a short investigation against him was carried out, the fourth issue of *Głos z Litwy* (Prasa tajna 1966, 234–244) appeared. The opinions of the Reds in Lithuania concerning the future of the nation's statehood was laid out once more: the construction of the future Polish state was to be based on the traditional territory of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, that is the

pre-partition borders from 1772, without maintaining any of the class traditions, but calls for equal rights being given to all members of society, for the equality of religions (Roman Catholicism, Orthodox Christianity and Judaism), nationalities and free development of the Lithuanian, Belarusian, Little Russian and Polish (Prasa tajna 1966, 234–235). Although the traditions of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in its territorial sense were referred to, that is the restoration of pre-partition borders of Russia, Lithuania and Poland, the Reds in Lithuania, just like in the Kingdom of Poland, emphasized that the new Polish state would not rely on the social and ethnic relations of the old Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, but would be a state based upon democratic principles that had been already worked out in the national development in the west and south of Europe.

Głos z Litwy contains reports from the battle field not only from Lithuania, but also from the Kingdom of Poland, suggesting a continuous sense of unity and solidarity throughout the uprising. It also contained articles describing Muravyov's repression, showing at the same time the distinct role of martyrdom in the uprising and provided some of the first analysis of the reasons for the losses incurred in battle. Just like in *Chorągiew Swobody* the emphasis was placed on the national union without any differentiation between nationalities, and the uprising was called Polish.

Conclusion

Analysis of these three periodicals, which were more or less related to Kanstancin Kalinoŭski, leads one to conclude the following:

Both *Chorągiew Swobody* and *Głos z Litwy* called for national unity and the restoration of the whole of the old Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth territory, and did not raise the idea of separatism in Lithuania and Belarus (just like *Mužyckaja Praŭda*), but the Polish language press did not emphasize differences in ethnicity. *Chorągiew Swobody*, *Głos z Litwy* and *Mužyckaja Praŭda* were adjusted over time to their reader base in terms of the language (Polish or Belarusian) and type of statements that were made.

Chorągiew Swobody and *Głos z Litwy* were aimed at the nobility and bourgeoisie circles in Lithuania and Belarus, promoted democratic slogans in a much gentler tone (of class solidarity and citizens' dignity), proclaimed the ideas of freedom, the tradition of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the struggle as a defence of the Western civilisation.

Mužyckaja Praŭda was addressed towards the peasantry and dealt with the issues important for the peasants' environment (land and imposition); whereas *Chorągiew Swobody*, *Głos z Litwy* and *Mužyckaja Praŭda* were all similar in their

attitude towards social issues and through a democratic programme that is best summed up in the Kalinoŭski last message: ‘Everybody is equal’.

The articles in *Chorągiew Swobody* and *Głos z Litwy,* but also those found in *Mužyckaja Praŭda* did not give rise to any claim that the authors or, indirectly, Kanstancin Kalinoŭski, as the patron of these newspapers, held any separatist ideas about Lithuania with regard to the Kingdom of Poland (let alone a separate Belarus). Regarding the political programme, the aims of the Reds in Lithuania and Belarus presented in *Chorągiew Swobody* and *Głos z Litwy* were not different in principle from the objectives of the Reds program presented in *Ruch*.

References

Sikorska-Kulesza, Jolanta, Bairauskaitė, Tamara (eds) (2010). *Apolonia z Dalewskich Sierakowska. Wspomnienia*, Warsaw: Neriton.

Gieysztor, Jakób, 1921. *Pamiętniki z lat 1857–1885*, vol.1. Wilno: Księgarnia Stowarz. Nauczycielstwa Polskiego.

Fajnhauz, Dawid, 1999. *1863. Litwa i Białoruś*. Warszawa: Neriton.

—, 1963. ‘Prasa konspiracyjna powstania styczniowego na Litwie i Białorusi (1861–1864)’, *Rocznik Białostocki*, vol. 4, Białystok: Muzuem w Białymstoku.

Kieniewicz, Stefan, 1983. *Powstanie styczniowe.* Warszawa: Wyd. Naukowe PWN

‘Prasa tajna z lat 1861–1864’, in *Powstanie styczniowe. Materiały i dokumenty*, *Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich,* 1966. Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków: Wydawnictwo PAN.